

Application No.: 10/591,650
Response to office action of January 10, 2008
Amendment dated May 12, 2008

REMARKS

The Examiner's action dated January 10, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully noted.

Claims 1-16 have been retained in their previous form, a new claim 17 has been added to define a further novel feature of the invention and a new independent claim 18 has been added to define the basic contribution of the invention in a form that includes a more positive recitation of the metal body. It is noted, however, that the Examiner has interpreted claim 1 as including the metal body.

The rejection in Section 2 of the action is traversed, firstly, because it is based on a reference that is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). This section of the statute is available only when a reference was patented or described in a printed publication more than one year prior to the filing date of the application undergoing examination. In the present case, the reference on which the Examiner relies is a US Patent Publication that was published after the filing date of the present application. Therefore, this rejection must be withdrawn.

However, it is noted that the applied reference is based on an earlier PCT application and it will be assumed that that application contains a disclosure comparable to that of the application on which the rejection was based.

Application No.: 10/591,650
Response to office action of January 10, 2008
Amendment dated May 12, 2008

Therefore, to advance matters, the substance of the rejection will be treated. Please note, however, that a rejection of claim 1, which has not been amended, on the basis of a different reference, or on different grounds, cannot be made final.

A significant feature of the present invention resides in the fact that the Young's modulus of the ceramic material constituting the support is equal to or lower than that of the deformable metal body to which the support is applied. As explained in the present specification, particularly at page 5, line 16 to page 6, line 2, this relationship results in a sensor having a calculated slope that is very close to the real slope. When the Young's modulus of the support is low compared to that of the metal body, its influence on the cross-sectional inertia of the resulting compound beam is reduced. Specification, page 13, lines 16-21.

Claim 1 cannot be considered to be anticipated by the applied reference, because the reference contains absolutely no disclosure whatsoever with regard to the Young's modulus of the various components of the structure disclosed therein.

Therefore, there is nothing in the disclosure of the applied reference that can be considered to anticipate the

Application No.: 10/591,650
Response to office action of January 10, 2008
Amendment dated May 12, 2008

recitation in application claim 1 (and claim 18) that the support has a Young's modulus that is equal to or lower than that of the deformable metal body. Thus, the statement in the explanation of the rejection that the reference discloses a ceramic material with a Young's modulus less than that of the metal body is without any support in the prior art.

Moreover, claims 1 and 18, the only independent claims in the application, specify that the support is of a ceramic material. This feature is also not disclosed in the applied reference, in which the support is always made of glass. As regards the Examiner's reference to paragraph 257 of the applied reference, attention is drawn to the fact that this paragraph contains a discussion of the composition of a wiring pattern, and not of a support.

Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection presented in Section 2 of the Action be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejections presented Sections 4 and 5 of the Action are traversed at least for the reason that these claims depend from claim 1 and for the considered allowable along there with.

Accordingly, it is requested that all of the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, that claims 1-18 be

Application No.: 10/591,650
Response to office action of January 10, 2008
Amendment dated May 12, 2008

allowed and that the application be found in allowable condition.

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /jmf/
Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:jnj
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\S\seb\Linglin2\PTO\2008-05-09-Amendment.doc